

Catholics and the Press

REGINALD J. DINGLE

*This brilliant article analyzing both the journalist and journalism in England will be of interest to American Catholics also.
Reprinted from the Month (London).*

FEW complaints are more frequently heard in these days than that of the "neglect of the Press" by Catholics. We are told that the most powerful influence in our midst for the formation of opinion is neglected by the Catholic body, while others make full use of it to their advantage and to our detriment. An element of truth in all this is undeniable. I had the privilege a couple of years ago of presenting the case for a fuller use of the secular Press, at the National Catholic Congress, and, while I feel that the present article is something in the nature of a palinode, I am far from wishing to controvert the whole case of the advocates of "Catholic publicity." With this preliminary qualification, I shall probably permit myself, like the rest of the world, the luxury of over-statement.

The proposition that the Press is a very influential institution seems hardly open to challenge. The daily newspaper is now omnipresent and its efforts are supplemented by an even more numerous weekly and monthly Press. Its increase has coincided with a decline of church-going in the general population and, as many will hold, with a regression in the authority and interest of politicians. Wireless broadcasting may be regarded as a new and formidable rival to the influence of the journalist, but it is true to say that the probabilities point to the newspaper Press as the most powerful factor in the formation of public opinion.

Analysis, however, suggests doubts whether the direct influence of newspapers on public opinion is as great as one might imagine. In politics, the movements of popular sympathy have failed to coincide with the popularity of particular organs. In 1906 the *Daily Mail* was the proud possessor of the largest circulation and its politics were true blue, but it was powerless to prevent the Liberal landslide of that year. The Socialist Party in 1929 was pathetically

under-represented in the Press, but it won a famous victory. On examination we find that the "constant reader," by whatever legitimate or illegitimate means attracted to his favorite journal, refuses to take his political opinion from it.

The conclusion I am disposed to draw from this is not that newspapers do not exert a powerful influence, but that their influence is not seen in the direct formation of opinion. It is a general psychological effect, and I think we are bound to conclude that it is a bad one. In considering that influence, it is legitimate to pay most attention to the popular Press, or, as it is sometimes called, "the stunt Press." This is not only because it reaches a very much wider circle of readers, but because its influence on its *clientèle* may be assumed to be greater. The subscriber to the *Times* is likely to be a person of some general culture, and newspapers will play a small part in his reading. The really popular Press, however, is read by those who read little or nothing else.

Before considering the general influence of the Press, it is appropriate to consider the journalist. If the Press be a powerful institution, the journalist must be a powerful person. We may admit a good deal that Mr. Belloc—with some truth and much exaggeration I think—has to say about the control of the journalist by the money power. The influence of the Pressman in that very large and important area of life in which the financier is not interested or has no conscious policy, is nevertheless very great, and with the developments of modern journalism, the center of gravity has shifted from the leader-writer who expresses opinion directly, to the reporter, the art editor and the caption writer, who exercises a selective and—on a low plane—a critical faculty. What sort of person is the modern journalist?

As one who for over a quarter of a century has earned his living by journalism, I could not decently write on this subject without paying a tribute to the men and women engaged in the profession. I believe there are as many of the essential virtues and as few of the essential vices to be found among working journalists as in any class of the community. Composed, like the rest of humanity, of good and bad, journalists have as a body a *camaraderie* and good fellowship, a sense of loyalty and a willingness to take the good and bad of life with an even philosophy which should prevent any journalist, however often he may be ashamed of

himself, from being ashamed of the confraternity to which he belongs. Nor do the virtues of journalists end there. The profession is in many ways an admirable training ground. I do not know of any other which gives its practitioners an insight into so many aspects of human life, and so protects them against narrow and unbalanced views. The priest, the doctor, the lawyer, are all brought into intimate contact with different classes of society. Each of them, however, if I may say so, studies humanity *secundem partem*. They deal, so far as their professional activities are concerned, with penitents, with invalids and with litigants. The intelligent newspaper reporter has a greater opportunity to study humanity *secundem totum*. It is often said that one half of the world does not know how the other half lives. The reporter catches them both at it. Consider the life of a reporter on a provincial paper. He attends inquests, funerals, police courts, sees the Methodists at their devotions, the atheists at their blasphemy, and the Spiritualists at their necromancy. He travels round the division with the Conservative, the Liberal and the Socialist. He travels back in the train with the prosecuting counsel after the Assizes, and has a drink with the Coroner after the inquest. He knows more aspects of life at first hand than anybody he meets. If he be a fool, it makes him arrogant; if he be intelligent, it makes him humble.

Having said all this, I am bound to present the other side of the picture. The journalist will possibly, and even probably, bring to this rich experience, an untrained mind. The priest, the doctor and the lawyer have to submit themselves to years of definite and systematic training. They have to undergo a discipline. The journalist may have done so. He may have had the discipline of a University training, and he may have been called to the Bar. None of this is necessary however. All that is needed is that he shall have a ready pen. Now, the ability to produce "good copy" answers to no useful quality of mind or capacity for social service. That is the curse of journalism. No amount of glibness will make a man a K.C., unless he study law; no skill in inventing theories about the thyroid or the pituitary will get a man on to the medical register unless he can satisfy the examiners that he has studied a group of exact sciences. A gift of tongues will not make a man a priest.

The advantages of the journalist's training are too generally ignored by his critics, but he has himself, too frequently, a blind eye for the deficiencies.

So much for the journalist. What of the Press? I have spoken of its general influence as bad, and there are two directions among a number, which I would specify as illustrating this contention. In the first place popular journalism creates a disastrous confusion of values in the public mind. I doubt if the full absurdity of the daily Press is adequately recognized even by thoughtful people, so familiar is the phenomenon. To begin with, there are so many columns to be filled with matter by a given time, irrespective of what happens. A particular piece of news must be made to appear startling and sensational and served up with double or treble column headlines. The emphasis given to this or that occurrence will depend upon a number of arbitrary factors—whether Parliament or the Law Courts are sitting, whether there is much sport and how many columns of advertisements have to set. It is useless to blame the news editor. These are the inevitable consequences of daily journalism; their effect on the popular mind is none the less unfortunate. The more deeply we consider it, the more important this matter of relative values and emphasis is seen to be. Is it not often the whole difference between orthodoxy and heresy? The tendency of newspaper reading must be, I think, to create an unbalanced and neurotic habit of mind.

The second vice I would specify is the distortion of the idea of authority. It is sometimes said that this idea—fundamental in any ordered society—is absent at present. It would be more accurate to say that it is confused and falsified. The most casual newspaper reader cannot have failed to notice that in contemporary journalism articles are chosen on account rather of their authors than of their contents. Any popular journal will publish the views of a cinema star on vaccination or those of a lawn tennis champion on spiritualism. There is here a conception of authority; it is that a general authority attaches to the opinions of anyone who is "in the news."

The most characteristic development of modern journalism, however, is the growing dominance of what is called "the publicity side." This embraces both direct advertising and the various forms of camouflaged advertising which ap-

of the news columns. In former days there was an honorable person known as the Editor of a newspaper. He was in general charge of the paper, expressed its views and controlled what appeared in it. If he found himself seriously at variance with the opinions of the proprietors on matters of substance he resigned, but, as long as he was editor, he discharged the functions of an editor and preserved his self-respect. What is an editor today on a popular newspaper? There are a managing editor, a news editor, a political editor, and I do not know how many more. Any of the great editors would have ordered out of his room a representative of the commercial side of the journal who proposed to say what should or should not appear in the news columns or the comments. Today the advertising man is the dictator. That is a great and significant change.

I have nothing to say about the men and women who earn their livelihood by advertising, but about the business itself there are some truths that seem to me to be obvious. Its essential ideas and motives are those which, carried into other departments of life, we have agreed to regard as vulgar and undesirable. We think it is a compliment to say of a man that he does not advertise. The professions which have preserved the conception of status will have nothing to do with it. We do not allow the doctor to tell us that he has cured more patients than his neighbor, or the barrister to announce in leaded type how many acquittals he secured at the Assizes. It is sometimes naïvely suggested that if we did we should know who were the best doctors and lawyers! We should merely know, of course, who were the most plausible advertisers.

Advertising may or may not be a socially useful adjunct to the selling of boots and safety razors. I confess that I am not thrilled by the suggestion that the Catholic Church should "advertise its wares." In spiritual matters, I believe nothing is more completely proved than the bankruptcy of advertising. If I were asked to name the most remarkable piece of publicity of our times, I should be inclined to cite the case of St. Thérèse of Lisieux. Is there any patent medicine or brand of whisky or what not which is known to as many people at this moment as "the Little Flower" is known? And her publicity has been secured by a resolute flight from publicity. A French working-class girl who re-

tires into a Carmelite Convent might reasonably expect that the world would hear no more of her. If Marie Françoise Thérèse Martin had gone on the stage in 1888 instead of taking the veil, and had employed an army of Press agents, she would be known to one person for every ten who know of her today. I have not the slightest doubt that an enclosed Order of nuns in any town will be followed by more conversions than would the establishment of a Catholic newspaper. Let us preserve a sense of proportion about "publicity."

It will be said—and I shall not challenge it—"this ought ye to have done and not to have left the other undone." And this leads me to a complaint which is often made by Catholic journalists against the Church in its dealings with the Press. It is stated that whereas the Anglicans and the Dissenters and the Salvation Army are always ready to co-operate with the journalist and to help him, there is no such readiness on the part of Catholics. For example, matter often comes into a newspaper office dealing with some aspect of Catholic affairs, our marriage laws or the question of our attitude to non-Catholic bodies. It has to be dealt with hastily, and the suggestion is made that the journalist who happens to be on duty should be able to telephone to Archbishop's House or some other authoritative quarter and "get a line" on it. In this way, it is suggested, a great deal of erroneous matter would be prevented from appearing. But would it? The fact of the matter is that truth refuses to adapt itself to the special and highly artificial conditions of daily journalism. Consider the situation in a newspaper office when a foreign telegram comes in which involves an intricate point of Canon Law. A busy journalist, who has already been wrestling with a murder case and a theatrical scandal, rings up an authority on Canon Law and asks him to elucidate it. The priest replies quite accurately that the position is intricate and cannot be briefly stated without grave misrepresentation. The reporter generously allows him ten lines, which are subsequently reduced by the sub-editor to five. Now it may do little harm when a daily paper publishes nonsense about Canon Law on its own responsibility. Most people have found that on technical subjects of which they know anything the newspapers are usually wrong, and they draw their own conclusions about

other technical subjects. But suppose these foolish paragraphs are preceded by the statement: "Our representative was informed at Archbishop's House"! Doctors know that in a message telephoned to a newspaper the thymus gland is likely to be metamorphosed into the thyroid, and few sub-editors will trouble about the *nuance* between "parathyroid" and "paratyphoid"! It would not be otherwise with theology.

Daily journalism consists largely in the rapid and condensed treatment by untrained minds of matter which even the most highly-trained minds cannot properly treat in this way. I am convinced, therefore, that it would be a serious error of policy to establish any such *liaison* between the ecclesiastical authorities and the secular Press as would appear to give the weight of authority to journalistic errors.

There is one direction in which the facilities offered by the general Press may be most properly and effectively used. I refer to the publication of signed articles such as those which Father Woodlock and well-known Catholic publicists contribute to the papers from time to time. These articles, however, are outside the hysterical rush of daily journalism and they are generally, though not invariably, safe from the sub-editorial pencil.

What I have seen of journalism leads me to disbelieve in any general anti-Catholic bias in the public Press, though, of course, there are individual instances. Those Catholics who see the hidden hand of anti-papal prejudice behind everything that appears in or is excluded from the newspapers have always appeared to me to have a tendency to "delusions of persecution." For the most part, newspapers do not wish to direct public opinion; they desire to exploit it. They will treat us, as they will treat Spiritualists or Mormons, solely by the test of whether we provide "good copy." That is perfectly correct journalism, and no journalist, Catholic or otherwise, has a right to apply any other. It does not follow, however, that it is good for the Church or assists in the conversion of England.

Probation

REVEREND JOSEPH J. AYD, S.J.

This remarkable address, dealing with a topic of great current interest in penology, was delivered last March in the Criminal Court of Baltimore under the auspices of the Committee on Probation of the Supreme Bench. Father Ayd is Professor of Sociology at Loyola College. This paper is a stenographic report of his ex tempore talk and is reprinted from the Daily Record.

IT is a great privilege to be up at this bench this evening. As a rule I am sitting down there on the benches during the course of a trial, and never once dreamed that I would ever stand up here and address an audience in front of me in this court room. So sometimes even things you do not dream of come true.

After the introduction given by Judge Ulman I am afraid that your expectations are raised so high that I will not be able to fulfill them. However, I will do my best. I know it is going to be good news to the Honorable Judges here on the bench, and also to the audience, that my two congregations,—as Judge Ulman said, I happen to be the State Prison Chaplain, and also the Chaplain of the City Jail and, therefore, I have two congregations—are wholeheartedly in favor of the universal extension of probation. No one who knows anything about prisons will blame them for that.

Now the title of my talk tonight also might be regarded as a misnomer after I get through. My talk tonight is entitled "Some Comments on the Psychology of Probation." I fear very much that you are going to find a great deal about probation in it and precious little about psychology, although I happen to be also, in addition to being professor of sociology, a professor of psychology, and am acquainted with the whole field, both empirical and rational, including also abnormal psychology.

Before going into my subject I wish to relieve myself of three preambles. The first is this—I have not much

faith in statistics. As some one has well said, Statistics have been liars from the beginning, and always will be. As a matter of fact nothing constructive, nothing really lasting has ever been achieved or accomplished by statistics. Men who are actually in the fight like judges on the bench, like priests in their various endeavors, like poor hard-working, inefficient prison chaplains, like all engaged in any endeavor in life work hard day in and day out, and then have their work torn apart later on by statisticians.

Secondly, I wish to make another preamble. Prisons are very bad places to send any one to. Some of you may know that by theory, I hope. Others may know it like myself from actual contact with prisons of all kinds. I have been chaplain here in the State of Maryland. I have assisted at the Eastern State Penitentiary in Philadelphia. I was prison chaplain in New York. I lived on Blackwell's Island, and I became personally acquainted with "Chicago May." Some of you may have read her autobiography in the Hearst papers. She was not as black as she was painted by her enemies, and she was not as black as she painted herself. She had some good qualities.

Now society sends to prison hundreds of thousands of men and women and boys and girls each year, and then expects the prison to carry them through some magic or mysterious curriculum, graduate them and send them back to society cured, that is to say, decent boys and girls and men and women. That is a very large order. If you know anything about prisons you will know that prisons as they are constructed today—I am not reflecting on the officials in any way—but if you were to know how prisons are equipped you will see the reason for the remark I have just made. If a man comes out of prison reformed it is for other reasons as a rule than any things that have been brought to bear on him in the prison.

Here is a statement I would like to make, and I think it can be substantiated. A man commits a crime. This crime calls for two or three or five years in the penitentiary, but the minute after he has committed that crime he repents of it. He is sincerely sorry for it, and yet he has to accept the course of the law and go to the "pen" for six years or ten years, and he is reformed before he ever gets to the institution. For that reason sometimes a chaplain has not a

very hard job on hand to reform some of the inmates, but as a rule the prison itself does not reform anybody.

My third preamble is this: About a week ago an article appeared in the Baltimore Evening *Sun* captioned, "What is Wrong with Probation?" The article was written by a friend of mine. Ignoring the fact that he meant to entitle the article "What is Wrong with Probation Work," he undertook in his first paragraph to give a very humble origin to probation. On reading that first paragraph I took umbrage. I admit probation has a very humble origin but it did not start with a hog. As you recall, in that article the author said that probation goes back to some vague distant past in the history of France when one of the Kings of France put a hog on probation. Now, as a matter of fact, history tells us that this hog, supposedly guilty of a criminal offense, was not put on probation. This hog was pardoned by the king because of its extreme youth. And there is all the difference in the world between being put on probation and being pardoned.

The true origin of probation, by the way, is in the immemorial custom of the Court to give suspended sentences, and this custom is founded in the common law. The origin of probation in the United States is truly romantic. It dates back to the year 1849. In 1849 a shoemaker, mind you, not a great jurist, not a great legislator or sociologist, not a great scientist, not a great physician, but a humble everyday, hard working shoemaker originated probation. If there are any shoemakers present in the audience, let them sit up and take notice. I hope we have in the City of Baltimore a great number of shoemakers who will follow in the steps of John Augustus who went to the Court and begged the judge to let a young man who had been arrested for intoxication, not a very serious crime, but a crime—asked the judge not to send this young man to prison where he would be hardened and converted probably into an habitual crook, but to release him under his charge and he would take care of him. And so he did, and about a year afterwards he brought this young man back before the very same judge and such a complete transformation had taken place in this young man that the judge could hardly be convinced it was the same young man. And so for fifteen years afterwards this humble cobbler of Boston, just a humble shoemaker, under-

took to care for hundreds of men and women and boys and girls with invariable success. Since that time probation has made terrific strides.

Back in 1878 the first State law was passed, restricted, however, to the City of Boston, State of Massachusetts. Later on other States followed the lead of Massachusetts, so that today we have 47 States, namely, all the States exclusive of Wyoming, that have probation laws. Thirty-six States and the District of Columbia and the Federal Courts have adult probation laws. In only about nine of these States are the probation laws Statewide, and only a few have their probation systems thoroughly manned and adequately equipped. Massachusetts, Indiana and New York blazed the trail, leaving the great Maryland Free State far in the rear.

Probation as a matter of fact, and it may sound somewhat heretical to say it—probation has absolutely nothing to do with the success or the failure of penal systems. It is merely another and a new device, another and a new way to meet a chronic problem. It is a device that has been discovered and elaborated and proposed for the treatment of a social cancer, and we make no miraculous claims for it. I ask you, isn't it strange that sensible people demand 100 per cent efficiency on the part of correctional agencies, and on the part of our correctional officials, and hardly half that amount of efficiency on the part of medicine and surgery? As I said before, crime is a social cancer. Let us take pathological cancer, for instance. All the years that the great physicians and the great scientists and the great chemists have concentrated on that terrible disease, and they know as much about cancer today as they did 500 years ago. The only thing they can propose to use—the great physicians and great surgeons,—are so-called preventive measures. When it comes to a diagnosis of the disease they usually diagnose it when it is too late to operate, the only cure being the knife when the disease is in its initial stage. They don't know whether it is a germ disease or not,—and yet we are expected to know everything about this social cancer which is called "crime."

Medicine and surgery have made marvelous progress in the last century or so, marvelous progress indeed, but I ask you has disease been eliminated? Has life been actu-

ally and really prolonged? We sometimes read articles by sociologists telling us that life has been prolonged at least twelve years. In the last twenty-five years they tell us life has been prolonged twelve years. Do not believe it. The average life as to prolongation is on the other end. There are just as many people forty to sixty years of age dying today as died 100 years ago. What is happening today because of certain discoveries of science, because of the great care now taken by the State, what has happened is this, that more babies are kept alive, and they are kept alive longer, and hence that shoves up the average length of life higher than it was 25 or 50 years ago. Has death been reduced to a minimum due to the marvelous advances of medicine and surgery? The frequent funeral cortege gives a very eloquent answer to that question. Has disease been eliminated, I ask you again? All you have to do to find out is to look around among your friends who are on the flat of their backs and visit our bulging hospitals,—and yet it seems so strange that with so supposedly exact a science as medicine, so supposedly exact a science as surgery, with failures surrounding them on all sides—that we poor people who are in penal work, who are in correctional work, who are in judicial work, who are pegging away at this vast and terrible social cancer called “crime,” that we are criticized right and left if we are not one hundred per cent efficient.

Probation, my dear friends, is nothing more than what the Wickersham report calls it. It is nothing more than an important step forward in the individualization of the treatment of crime. It is this and hardly anything more. For the benefit of those who have not attended the previous lectures I wish to give a specific definition of probation so that you will understand thoroughly what subject I am talking about. For the moment though I will have to digress.

I was accosted this afternoon here in the city on two occasions by two different friends, and they said, “Father, are you wet or dry?” “Why,” I said, “I thought everybody in Baltimore knew I was wet. Why the question?” They said, “I see you are lecturing on prohibition tonight.” I said, “No, unfortunately I am not. I could make a much better speech against prohibition than I can in behalf of probation.” Now, probably that question was due to a

slight astigmatism of the eye. As soon as they heard I was not going to talk about prohibition they said, "Well, we won't be there."

Probation is a system of treatment. It is the putting of a convicted offender without imprisonment, without incarceration, except temporarily perhaps, for investigation and study—putting the convicted offender out at large under the supervision of an officer who is called a probation officer, for a certain definite period of time for his complete, if it is possible, rehabilitation. That is the probation we are talking about tonight. Historically probation started that way. It was a kind of social agency which investigated the defendant and undertook to care for him after his conviction and after he was released on suspended sentence by the judge. But within recent times probation has become something more than that. It has come to mean more and more a sort of *intelligence bureau* that works and cooperates with the judge. It investigates the offender, investigates his social conditions, his home life, his family life, his preceding life, investigates what is wrong with his body and his mind, and makes its report and lays it before the judge in order that the judge might be guided by the report made and the recommendations made by the investigating probation officer. So we can see that probation is little more than a mere system of supervision. And so I hope it will become so in this State—it is so to a certain extent—an intelligence bureau cooperating with the judge.

Now, so that no mistake may be made about our enthusiasm for this new social agency I wish to say that we do not claim and have never made the claim that probation is a *universal* remedy for crime. It is not. It is a very selective process and it consists of a very individual and selective treatment. Not all the defendants that come before the judge are worthy or are eligible or are fit to be put on probation. Very few of them are fit to be put on probations, and therefore very few criminals are put on probation. For instance, in the Catholic Probation Bureau of New York in the year 1925 there were 3,065 cases studied by the probation department there, a very efficient probation department. Of these 3,065 defendants that were studied and investigated by this department only 18 per cent were put on probation. In the City of Baltimore last

year, as we know from recent survey of the Criminal Justice Commission and from the reports of the probation department, only 16 per cent of the defendants that were studied were put on probation. I think, judging from the statistics to which I have access, the average number of defendants whose cases are studied and who are put on probation, is 20 per cent.

As I said before, the treatment meted out in our probation system is individual and specific. How different is the treatment meted out by our prisons? Let us imagine a large hospital in the center of the City of Baltimore with maybe 800 or 1,000 beds. This hospital is for the treatment of all diseases, infectious, chronic and other diseases. All kinds of people come there who are sick. Some have nephritis. Some have cancer. Some have tuberculosis. Some have cardiac troubles of different kinds. In fact, they have all the various diseases listed in our textbooks of pathology. But the only treatment ever made in this hospital is that every night they get a big, black pill. The same treatment meted out to them all, no matter what the disease, no matter what the trouble. Now, of course, you would say that would be certainly a most outrageous hospital—no matter what the disease they get the same dose. It is comparable, my dear friends, to our prisons. In prisons the treatment is *mass* treatment. The men and women that come there—because maybe of the overcrowded conditions in our penal institutions—each and every one receives the same treatment. Our prisons are not equipped for hardly any other work. It would be to expect the impossible,—and I have had fourteen years of experience in prison work. It would be to expect the impossible to expect a prison to reach down into the vitals of a criminal and discover and eradicate the cause of his criminality. Prisons are not equipped for such marvelous work as this. But the probation system, my dear friends, with its specific and individual treatment, with its method of approach to the criminal, with its method of treatment and supervision of the criminal can in its own way do that thing which we regard as somewhat marvelous—can discover the true causes back of crime.

The probation system is founded on orthodox psychology. It is founded on the fact that we are human beings made up of bodies and souls essentially similar, but not

alike, because of our different characters, because of our different temperaments, because of our different wishes and desires and ambitions and dreams, because of different circumstances of birth, circumstances of upbringing, because of our different education and different contacts in life, we are each of us individuals, therefore, socially alike, but as regards individuals, and as regards our individual abilities and endowments, we are distinct and separate from one another. That is the foundation of the probation system, the acknowledgment of the social similarity of men and women, and the acknowledgment of the differences, the individualization of the different men and women, boys and girls.

I want to present to you tonight, therefore, briefly, as it is sometimes said, in a nutshell, the true psychology of probation. Those of you who are acquainted with science of biology know this, that when a baby is born its brain contains possibly all of the fissures and convolutions that develop later on. Its brain contains what the biologists call neuroblasts. Neuroblasts are embryonic neurons of the brain. These neuroblasts develop into functioning neurons only when stimuli from the outside are brought to act upon these neuroblasts. Therefore the noises coming in through the ear develop those neuroblasts that refer to hearing. The various colored objects pass before the eyes, these sensation stimuli, enter through the eye and into the brain, and the neuroblasts that regard sense of vision are developed and become neurons of sight, etc. So you see these neuroblasts, embryonic neurons in the cortex of the brain, need external stimuli in order to develop. If it should so happen that a person is born without the proper organs of hearing—if it should so happen that a person is born without the proper organs of sight—if it should so happen that a person is born without the proper organ of taste or touch, then those neuroblasts never develop, and hence the person is partially mentally defective, intelligently defective at least in that specific phase. A person born blind, not one that becomes blind later on in life, the person born blind never has a correct idea of color. A person born deaf never has a correct idea of sound. A person born without the power of taste never has the correct idea of taste. What is needed, therefore, is not merely the neuroblasts for sensation, for development, but outside stimuli introduced to the brain.

Now I wish to bring in a comparison to point out in a very brief way the psychology of probation. The trouble with the criminal or the trouble with criminals is that their *moral* "neuroblasts" have never been developed, and for that reason they have developed into men and women or growing boys and girls who act in a way which contravenes social customs, or contravenes penal legislation. They have within them those moral neuroblasts but they have not been developed. There is always a phase of character defect in the criminal. He may be physically malformed, which does not mean a thing. He may be otherwise abnormal, which does not mean a thing. I am not speaking about insane people tonight. Some criminals are insane. I am not referring to them. Some criminals are feeble-minded. I am not referring to them. I am speaking of the average criminal that we meet in our institutions, and the average criminal that stands before the judges' bench on trial. The trouble is that the moral neuroblasts of these men and women have never been developed. They are there, but because of some defect, some defect in character, because of some defect due to heredity, some defect of environment, some defect of education, those stimuli that are constantly surrounding them that normally would enter in and develop these boys and girls and men and women into men of character and decency, do not come in because of these obstructions—just as in the case of a person who has the neuroblasts of sight undeveloped, cannot see and has no intellectual idea of sight, so the criminal with these various neuroblasts undeveloped is converted into a person who acts in an anti-social way.

I think that brings out properly the psychology upon which the probation system is built, and that is just exactly the work that the probation system and those who are engaged in that system, the probation worker, should realize. It is the business of the department, the duty of the department and of the probation worker to do away with those obstructions, to do away with those character defects, to do away with those defects in environment, in social life, in family life, to do away with any defect it is possible to do away with in order that the stimuli of life, the complex social life that we have to live today, might normally and in due course produce their proper effect and turn out men

of decency, men and women of decency, men and women who will respect and regard the rights of others, men and women of ambition, men and women of ideals, and men and women of character. And this marvelous effect, my dear friends, and it is marvelous when we come to think of it, is brought about only in one way. It is brought about by the constructive friendship which is formed, which should be formed between the probationer and the probation officer who represents the Court.

I wish to say a few words about some of the results of probation as it works in those communities where they have a well equipped probation department, and where this probation department is expertly manned. I am reading now from the official report of the National Probation Association. In New York the percentage of success of 23,337 persons put on probation in 1927 was 74.8. Therefore, probation in New York State was 74 per cent successful. The report that came in today to the probation department from Rochester for the year 1930 shows a very high percentage of success. Ninety-one per cent of those put on probation in Rochester were successful. The Catholic Probation Bureau of New York City, which is affiliated with the Court of General Sessions of New York, one of the largest criminal Courts in the world, reports the average success that year of 85 per cent. In Maryland, at least for the year 1923, there was reported 71 per cent success. Now I admit that in the report of last year the success was not what it should have been. The work did not accomplish what it should have accomplished. but his Honor, Judge O'Dunne, and his Honor, Judge Ulman, have answered the report as it should have been answered, showing why and wherefore there were so many failures due to the fact that the department is not equipped with a personnel that is able to handle the case loads that come in there daily. As a matter of fact I found on rereading Judge Ulman's speech that one probation officer was handling 160 cases. Now how any person can form a constructive friendship with 160 people who live in different parts of the city is beyond me. Hence you will see that there is an essential flaw in the work of that probation officer but not due to the officer. Penologists figure that no probation officer can handle efficiently more than about forty cases.

I had intended to go somewhat into the economics of the problem but I will leave that to the speaker of next week. You will be surprised to hear how much money is saved to the State by the probation system when thoroughly organized, and how much less expense to the State is a man on probation than a man in prison. For instance, I will mention Maryland for 1931. It costs \$324.54 to maintain a prisoner in the Maryland Penitentiary. On probation the probable cost will be about \$25. In New York State it cost \$552.72 to maintain a man in prison, whereas it costs only \$29.34 a year to maintain a man on probation. In Massachusetts it cost \$350 to maintain a man in prison, whereas it cost only \$35 to maintain him on probation.

As a little finale to this brief talk tonight—I see time is moving along—I wish to tell a story which is a true story. It will bring out several of the phases that I have briefly dwelt upon tonight. It is the story of a man whom I prepared for death in the death house in the Maryland Penitentiary a little over two years ago. This young man, just twenty-eight years old, had been sent to the penitentiary for life for having participated in a hold-up in which there was a homicide. This young man did not do the shooting. Later on in an attempted prison break a guard was killed, and this young man also involved in this prison break, although he did not do the shooting, was sentenced to be hung together with the other man who did the shooting. Some of you may know to whom I refer. Now I prepared this young man for death. I was with him daily up until the night of the execution, and that is a very long vigil, at least for the chaplain.—The night preceding the execution. This young man, when the physician came to him about quarter past ten with a very enticing looking bottle of Melvale whisky, and tried to persuade him to take a drink for his nerves to give him that false inspiration and false courage which liquor sometimes gives, absolutely refused to take it. The doctor insisted. Finally, the young man turned to me and said, "Father, do I have to take that stuff?" and I said, "No, Charlie, you don't." He said, "I don't want it. My nerves are all right." He turned to the doctor and the doctor was rather pale. He said, "Doctor, it seems to me what you need is a good drink yourself, drink it yourself." He would not take it. Twenty minutes after eleven the

same night the same doctor came up with a hypodermic syringe to give him a little shot of morphine, an insignificant shot, it is true, but still it was a shot of morphine, and he approached the cell with a hypodermic needle in his fingers ready to administer it, and the young man refused. He said, "No, I don't want any morphine in me. I never took it in my life and do not intend to begin taking it now." He turned to me and said, "Father, do I have to allow him to do that?" I said, "No, if you don't want it you do not have to submit to it." He said, "I don't want it. Father, this is one night in my life when I want to have a clear mind." That young man went to his death to my mind, not with bravado, not with any false show of courage. He went to his death really and truly like a hero, showing there in the last few moments of his life what sterling character he had in him. What a great pity, and I say it when I look back with intense sympathy upon that scene and upon that boy—he was only a boy—what a great pity that some one earlier in his life, some decent, friendly, kindly, sympathetic probation officer had not taken him in charge and drawn out of him in his early days that character which he had in him. But why look back and shed tears over the past? What are we trying to do in the City of Baltimore in our probation system is to forestall anything like that. It is to discover in the criminals, defendants that come before the Bench, how many of them have that character in them, how many of them are fit to be put out under proper and decent and sympathetic supervision and transform them into decent and law-abiding men and women.

Mid-Year Index

The Catholic Mind, Vol. XXX

January 8 to June 8, 1932, inclusive

1. Ephesus, A. H. Ryan, p. 1
Religious Discrimination, George D. Bull, p. 10
2. Where Does Adam Come In? Joseph Keating, p. 21
Private Ownership, M. de Munnynck, p. 33
3. Encyclical: The Light of Truth, Pope Pius, p. 41
Catholics and Disarmament, John Eppstein, p. 65
4. Catholics and Disarmament, Joseph Keating, p. 69
The Church and Disarmament (Papal Statements), p. 81
Nationality, Father Delos, p. 86
5. Mixed Wedlock, Bishop Lillis, p. 89
The True Paulinism, Cuthbert Lattey, p. 97
6. Economic Principles, Lewis Watt, p. 109
A Sermon, G. K. Chesterton, p. 125
7. Church Studies, Edward Helsham, p. 129
The Will in Educational Psychology, C. I. Doyle, p. 138
Back to the Cherry Tree, G. K. Chesterton, p. 145
8. Greed Is the Witch, Michael O'Shaughnessy, p. 149
Stabilization of Industry, Michael O'Shaughnessy, p. 156
What Caused the Depression? Wilfrid Parsons, p. 165
9. Eucharistic Piety, Gommaire LaPorta, p. 169
A Right Attitude Toward the Eucharist, Joseph Kramp, p. 181
Christ in the Eucharist, Sister Francis Rita, p. 187
10. Why Employ an Architect? John LaFarge, p. 189
Frederic Ozanam, Archbishop Goodier, p. 195
Marie Stopes at Oxford, J. Shradly Post, p. 206
11. Catholics and the Press, Reginald J. Dingle, p. 209
Probation—Its Psychology, Joseph J. Ayd, p. 216